

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Title is amended by the present response to be more clearly descriptive of the claimed invention.

Further, the specification is amended by the present response to update the status of the parent application serial no. 09/950,625.

Claims 1 and 3 are also amended to address the objections noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

Applicants also note that returned with the outstanding Office Action was a form PTO-1449 for an Information Disclosure Statement filed October 9, 2003. In that returned form PTO-1449 certain references were indicated as not considered as they were not supplied. However, in that respect applicants note those references were cited in the parent of the present application, the present application being a divisional application, and thus it is believed that it was not necessary to supply such references for their consideration. Thus, applicants request a new form PTO-1449 indicating consideration of all of the noted references or alternatively that those references be noted on a form PTO-892.

Claims 1-3 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 4,780,690 to Voorman.

Addressing the above-noted rejection based on Voorman, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note that each of claims 1-3 is amended by the present response to clarify features indicated therein. More particularly, each of claims 1-3 is amended by the present response to recite a mixer device including substantially the amplifier circuit from claim 15 of the parent application, U.S. patent 6,768,379, and a variable gain amplifier. The subject matter set forth in claims 1-3 is believed to be clear from the original specification,

see for example the non-limiting example of Figure 16. That subject matter was noted as allowable in the parent of the present application. Further, that subject matter is believed to clearly distinguish over Voorman.

The circuit in Figure 2 of Voorman, i.e. the transconductor, includes a first differential amplifier and a second differential amplifier, see for example column 4, lines 46-55. In other words, the circuit in Figure 2 of Voorman includes only differential amplifiers.

In contrast to the teachings in Voorman, claims 1-3 set forth a mixer including an amplifier circuit including a differential amplifier and a common emitter amplifier connected in parallel to the differential amplifier, and a variable gain amplifier. Such a mixer is shown as a non-example in Figure 16 of the present specification showing an amplifier circuit including a differential amplifier 102 and a common emitter amplifier 101, provided in a mixer with a variable gain amplifier 402.

In other words, in the claims as currently written the amplifiers include a differential amplifier and a common emitter amplifier, in contrast to Voorman in which the circuit of Figure 2 includes only differential amplifiers.

In such ways, claims 1-3 are believed to clearly distinguish over the cited art to Voorman.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS/rac

I:\ATT\MSNS\24's\243224\243224US-AMD 2.14.05.doc